
ICANN68 | Virtual Policy Forum - GNSO - RrSG Membership Meeting
Tuesday, June 23, 2020 - 15:00 to 16:00 MYT

GRAEME BUNTON: All right. I have got 3:01. 56 people in the room. We might as well get started. And now I'm not hearing anyone. It looks like people can hear me.

>> This meeting is being recorded.

GRAEME BUNTON: There we go. Okay.

ZOE BONYTHON: Hi, Graeme. I'm just going to say a few words to kick us off, if that's all right.

GRAEME BUNTON: Oh, yeah, sure.

ZOE BONYTHON: Because we're obviously using a Webinar platform, which is necessary now, so just to -- for anyone that doesn't know, so I'm Zoe. I am going to be monitoring the chatroom and the Q&A

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

pod, which is not something we normally have at our membership meetings. But it is something that we're going to be using today as part of ICANN68.

So hopefully you're already familiar with this now. There's this separate Q&A pod as opposed to the regular chatroom. So if you could try to put any actual sort of questions and comments that need to be read out, make sure you put them in the Q&A pod, okay?

And then there will be -- because we have this -- because this is a Webinar function rather than a normal room, it's not like you can just unmute and speak as usual.

So if you can note that the chat sessions are all being archived and to make sure to follow all of the ICANN expected standards of behavior.

And the other very important thing that's happening for our first time at our meeting is that we have real-time transcription. So you need to -- if you want to access that, you need to click on the "closed caption" button, which is in the Zoom toolbar. And then you'll be able to view the real-time transcription in English, of course. It's not interpretation; it's transcription.

Yeah, hopefully everything is clear, and I'm going to hand over to you, Graeme.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thank you, Zoe.

Good morning, everybody. I hope everybody's doing well and enjoying ICANN68 so far. Lots of people in the room, which is good. For me it is 3:00 a.m., which is, I think, arguably the worst time to chair a meeting. It's quite warm in Toronto today, and my air conditioning is broken, and it's currently 28.2 degrees Celsius in my office. I've got like a weird baggy thing I've thrown in the freezer to try and keep me cool. So I'm having a great time. This is going to be fun.

Our agenda got bounced around a little bit, and I think we've had to drop some items, so the meeting might end up being a little bit light. But we'll see how we go and try and get through.

So this is a reminder -- and in case we maybe have some new people in the room that -- this is our membership meeting. We typically do this -- so, A, we do these every two weeks. B, when we do these at an ICANN meeting, at a regular meeting, they would be longer. At a shorter policy meeting, which this is, they are typically just an hour or two depending how much time we

can get on the schedule. This is often where we do some updates.

And all of the -- all of these membership meetings are about getting updates to the membership and feedback from the membership. It's always really important that we hear from you guys so that we can ensure that we're representing the stakeholder group appropriately and all the different avenues that we're doing so. This is especially important at an ICANN meeting.

And so this is my reminder for everybody that this is -- we try and make this a friendly space and really encourage you to put something into the chat, raise your hand, talk, ask a question. The feedback from the membership is super important in making sure that we're running this appropriately.

Speaking of which, the first thing on the agenda is intro to the new and farewell to the old ExCom. I think we punt that to the end of the meeting because that, I think, is going to be weirdly anticlimactic if we do that first.

And so maybe we go right on into contentious issues at the GNSO Council and then DNS abuse. See where we're at from there and then talk about incoming, outgoing, old and new.

Welcome, Goran. Pleased to have you join us. I hope you find this entertaining and engaging. All right.

I'm not seeing hands or questions. This is a slightly different format than I'm used to. So if I'm missing something, Zoe or someone, throw something at me in the chat or shout at me and we'll figure it out.

Okay. Having said all that, let's dig into -- oh, and Becky Burr. Oh, boy, it's a well-attended 3:00 a.m. membership call. Great. Welcome, everybody.

All right. Contentious issues at the GNSO Council, this is GNSO Council reps.

Is this Pam, Michele, Greg? Which one of you guys are taking this?

PAM LITTLE:

Hi, Graeme. It's Pam Little. I'm happy to take it to start with.

GRAEME BUNTON:

Also, just so everybody knows, Pam is always on the worst time zone for all of our membership meetings. And so I am getting to enjoy the full Pam experience right now. And it makes me

appreciate what you do for us on a regular basis, Pam. Thank you.

Please go ahead.

PAM LITTLE:

Thank you, Graeme, once again. And hello, everyone. I'm really, really sorry that if you are getting up at 2:00, 1:00 in the morning or for Graeme, 3:00 in the morning. As Graeme said, I have some experience with that. But I'm glad I get the opportunity to see you guys suffer. No, I'm only kidding.

Anyway, I just want to share with you guys what the council is dealing with right now. And I didn't use the word or choose the word "contentious." I believe that was Zoe's handiwork. Maybe Zoe perceived those issues as contentious, and maybe they are contentious. I feel they are challenging, maybe, that the issues that the council are looking into or dealing with at the moment.

And to me, they mainly associate with the EPDP as you would probably agree or understand why that is the case.

So in terms of EPDP, we have the phase 1 implementation and they apparently -- some disagreement in the EPDP phase 1 implementation team with regard to Recommendation 7.

And some of our members will probably know Recommendation 7 is about whether registrars are required to send thick WHOIS, i.e. registrant contact information, to registries or not. Apparently, there are two very different interpretations as to whether contact information is mandatory or optional.

And I must admit, myself, that reading Recommendation 7, it is a bit confusing and not entirely clear what the intent of that recommendation is.

So the Board wrote to the council. The council then wrote back. And the council decided it is probably best to go by the existing GNSO policies and procedures. And that boils down to what we have in the so-called implementation review team principle and guidelines, which sets out the IRT's role and if there's a disagreement or unclear, uncertainty about intent of a policy recommendation, what happens, what process to follow.

So that process is now ongoing. The GNSO Council liaison, Sebastien Ducos, is our hero at the moment, I guess, tasked with trying to solve this issue, seeing if they can resolve this matter within the IRT. If not, I guess it will be deferred back to the council. Then the council would have to decide what to do with that particular issue or topic.

And the other topic associated with the EPDP is phase 2. And as you know, the phase 2 EPDP team is in the last mile, home run, to try to deliver the final report on the SSAD.

But there are also a number of topics that are so-called priority 2, items such as legal versus natural persons, such as accuracy. And there is also the perennial question about the proxy and privacy issues. So there's a number of so-called priority items that a number of community groups feel council need to be clear about what the council will do, when and how to address them.

So these are not easy topics for the council. And as you know, these are not easy topics for the EPDP team either. And there oftentimes has been discussion but no consensus on these topics. That's why they are still open issues.

But then when it comes to the council, at the council level, there are also diverse views about how to deal with them.

So that's why I call them challenging issues. They are obviously contentious but difficult. And we are sort of dealing with EPDP for the first time in ICANN history but also as a council confronted with mainly sort of more challenging and diverse issues, where there are different views or different opinions about different stakeholder groups and council representatives.

So that's what I mean.

And you can see just within this week there's a draft letter been prepared by the council in response to SAC111. That was an SSAC paper issued that contains some comments on the draft initial report of the EPDP phase 2 as well as some recommendations -- or criticisms, I may say, about the EPDP process. And the council feels it is important to probably clarify some of the GNSO processes as a response to SSAC.

So that draft letter is now in circulation. So our members or our policy vice chair or ExCom, I encourage you to take a look. If you have any comments, please let the council reps know, including myself.

And then the other letter that came to the council was a letter from the GAC. I think that was yesterday. The GAC again wants assurance from the council as what the council will do regarding those so-called priority 2 items I just mentioned earlier.

So that really is what I feel the most pressing and challenging topics or issues in front of the council right now. And obviously as usual, we seek guidance, direction, from ExCom. And ExCom would also seek feedback from our membership. So I thought it's a good time that I share those with you.

And with that, I -- I will just stop there and see whether Greg or Michele have anything to add.

Thanks, Graeme.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thank you, Pam.

I see a hand from Michele.

MICHELE NEYLON: Yeah, thanks. Morning, everybody. Michele for the record.

I suppose the other -- I mean, rather than just focusing purely on the EPDP, I think one of the other topics that is probably of interest to registrar colleagues is transfers. So that's another topic that is up for discussion at the next GNSO Council meeting which is Wednesday, I think, this week.

So we have a vote on a request to which -- vote to request initial report on the transfer policy.

So I know that's something that a lot of people are looking at. I suppose the interconnection between the ongoing discussions around the EPDP and dealing with these outstanding issues -- or sorry. Correction. Pam, it is tomorrow. I beg your pardon. I think some people have been asking whether or not the EPDP

will take priority over transfers and how that's going to look. Because obviously we've got the EPDP phase two which is meant to be coming to an end, but as Pam pointed, out we've still got these outstanding issues from the EPDP, so. It's really a question of looking at the prioritization which has become and continues to be a major challenge within Council.

GRAEME BUNTON:

Thanks, Michele.

All right, I'll go back to Pam's thing first in the EPDP. Boy, that's a lot of acronym soup going on. I wonder how many new people we have on the call. And so maybe throw your hand up or put something in the chat if you weren't following along with all of that.

Pam, I guess my first question to you is have you seen the document that I think came out of the IRT that we produced, and I think there was some help from the registries in there but it's largely a registrar document about the contentious issues remaining as we see them, and it's maybe a week or two hold at this point. I don't know if there's been a shift there. But these are the issues that we think have been identified as contentious and problematic. This is the legal advice that we received during the course of the EPDP. This is the Registrar Stakeholder Group

stance. This is why. Or this is what we need would need to change for us to be able to move from our current position to another.

I think we should be sharing that with the wider community. I don't see why not at this point. Because from my perspective, I think it makes it relatively clear we're not ideologues in a lot of this. We can be pragmatic but here are the relatively substantial things that need to be addressed for us to be able to find some sort of compromise. And I'm curious if you've seen that and if you think it's helpful, and if it would be helpful for your GNSO colleagues as well.

PAM LITTLE:

Thank you, Graeme. It's Pam Little for the record again. Yes, I have seen that document much it was very helpful, and I understand it was put together by our Registrar Stakeholder Group's representative on the EPDP team. However, the problem to me is right now, we seem to have -- the community seems to be divided into two large camps, if you like, one of the contract party house and the other one seem to be the rest, if I can put it that way.

So the contract party house position is very clear.

But I guess as a council, we also -- we face this division, if you like, within the Council. So we also -- whatever dynamics you see in the EPDP is also being played out very similarly at the council level. So there's no unified voice or position, if you like, at the council. So that's why I feel it's challenging, because in the past, personally I have been seeing so many issues in front of the council that are so divided, so divisive, if you like, and so attract different views and opinions. So I guess that's one of the challenges. So how we can also get consensus at the council level about how to deal with those so-called remainder issues or priority two issues. So that is the challenge.

GRAEME BUNTON:

Thanks, Pam.

Right. I'm kind of curious if there's -- like to me, it feels like from having read that document that, boy, there's places that we just can't compromise on. People want us to, but it feels like this is -- some of this is a pretty hard line, and we're not trying to be obstructionist but it doesn't feel like there's way to make this move, then.

James is saying in the chat that the NCSG aligns with us on some issues and not a hundred percent. Is the CPH plus the NCSG enough to get this thing through the Council?

Yeah, and sorry, I'm agreeing with James in the chat that -- and maybe this is a place to hear from some of our EPDP members. You're right, it's not our compromise to give.

So what are the decision points, I guess, for Pam and GNSO Councilors? Is it clear to you how this process is going to play out? And where we're going to have to, like, vote, say yes, say no?

PAM LITTLE:

Hi, Graeme. It's Pam speaking again. I hope we don't go down the path of voting and we can somehow achieve certain consensus within the Council.

I agree and acknowledge what James said. The NCSG seem to be, on some issue, aligned with us, but my concern is they are also the -- the ACs, for example, the ALAC, the GAC, the SSAC, they seem to be also very aligned in their position. So we're talking about the whole ICANN community, not just within the GNSO community. So I guess that presents another level of challenge.

We don't vote on -- We haven't really scheduled any voting on these topics, but -- so it's been sort of under discussion. And because it's so divisive or contentious or difficult, we haven't

reached a position. But I guess it may become clearer after tomorrow's meeting as to what the Council intend to do with those topics. It is not an easy topic and it's a slow process.

I'll stop there, see if Michele or Greg have anything to add or even James or our EPDP reps might have something to add.

Thank you.

GRAEME BUNTON:

Thanks, Pam.

I see a hand from Greg and then Michele.

GREG DiBIASE:

Hey, so I also wanted to point out I think there are some places where we can't compromise just from a legal perspective, like if we're looking at the legal versus natural person issue, and we're not able to say with certainty that information provided for a legal company isn't personal data. Like these are legal issues that are really, really -- I don't even want to use the word compromise because we're looking at the legal advice and there's just nothing we can do.

There -- I think there's other issues where later, down the line, we can address, like privacy/proxy for example. We can figure out what the next steps are. Or even accuracy. I know this group does not believe more accuracy or full policy development in that area is warranted at this time, but, you know, we could consider a scoping team to evaluate that issue.

So I don't think it's -- I don't think necessarily all these issues are created equal, and I agree with Pam, we'll have a little more clarity in the coming weeks as to, you know, where we can find avenues to move forward to address these so-called priority two issues.

GRAEME BUNTON:

Right. Okay. Thanks, Greg. It's probably helpful if everybody get a read on that document that we produced.

So...

I see a question from Becky. I don't know that I can -- I can answer that substantively because I'm not in the -- you know, in the PDP or the IRT.

I don't know, Zoe, if you have the latest version of that doc, but let's see if we can get that out to membership in the very near future so everyone can have a read.

And I suspect Becky and Goran might find that interesting, too.

Michele and then James.

MICHELE NEYLON:

Thanks, Graeme. Michele again for the record.

Yeah, I think I tend to agree with a lot of what Pam and Greg were saying. Like the -- at the moment, we're not being asked to vote on anything at Council. We're having a, quote, unquote, "discussion" about the EPDP. So the kind of general thing at the moment is that the EPDP is behind schedule. It has to extend. That in itself isn't an issue for it to extend just to wrap up. The problem is that these other issues that are, quote, unquote, "outstanding," priority two, all of that, are being used by some parties as a kind of stick to beat us all with in that if they -- they feel that if these things are not addressed right now, that as far as they're concerned, the EPDP has been a failure, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera. And that I think is a major problem because realistically, that is not the truth.

So I'm not really sure how that's going to play out. In terms -- If -
- I don't think it's going to come to a vote straight away, but I
think we're going to have a lot of heated discussions at Council
around this.

GRAEME BUNTON: Yep. Thanks, Michele.

James.

JAMES BLADEL: Hey, Graeme. Thanks. James speaking. Not a whole lot to add
beyond what Greg and Michele have contributed, and I'm kind of
looking over in the direction of my colleagues on the EPDP.

Some of these issues are somewhat binary, and it is -- I think it is
somewhat disingenuous to say we have to find a compromise.
You know, in some cases it isn't either/or proposition, and the
risks, of course, are asymmetrical and fall on contracted parties
if we get this wrong. I think that's particularly true for legal -- for
the issue of legal and natural.

One of the metaphors we use is, like,, you know, if I want to have
pizza for dinner and you want to eat dirt, a compromise -- an
acceptable compromise is not to pour dirt all over a pizza, and it

seems like that's some of the issues we're being asked to sort of meet in the middle here.

I also wanted to point out, I think Becky mentioned there's a possibility that we are talking past each other. I don't believe so. I think that part of the concern is that, particularly with the legal versus natural issue,, you know, setting aside some of the privacy concerns, we're talking about creating different categories of registered nameholders which is a new concept at ICANN in the gTLD space, and would also presumably need to apply retroactively to over a hundred million existing registrations, some of them going back decades. And a change of that magnitude probably needs to have corresponding benefits of that magnitude. And we just don't see those, not to mention that no one has really told us how to effectively and accurately pull that off.

So I think this is a huge concern, and it's not that we're digging in. I just -- I don't know that this is the kind of thing where another month or another year, we're going to be any closer on some of these issues.

Sorry to sound cynical at this time of night.

GRAEME BUNTON: No. I mean, I think this is...

I mean, we knew there were thorny issues and we've known about them for a very long time, and it's really coming down to the end where we need to figure out these last bits. And we are where we are. I certainly don't think we got here without being as thorough as we can possibly be working through all of these contentious issues. So I feel good about process.

Is that a -- no, that's a hand from Volker. Please, Volker, go ahead.

VOLKER GREIMANN: Okay, yes, thank you. I think legal versus natural is a problem that we've been as a community tackling with in many a group over the years. I mean, I certainly remember it to -- having to discuss it as part of the WHOIS review team efforts. It is simply something that past experience does not really lend itself to a compromise. Even if we said that going forward, we would do it for all new registrations, it's still a problematic issue because experience has shown that customers are using the organization field any which way they want to.

We also have learned that any grandfathering schemes that we agree to for certain patterns such as the verification of the mail

addresses that was grandfathered in, sooner or later meets the requests that now it's been long enough. Now we also have to touch the legacy domain names, and that's something that we also do not want.

I think the only compromise that we can agree to is that we allow registrars and registries to make that differentiation at their own risk and deal with whatever they feel is the best way forward.

So if a registrar says we are confident that all our data is perfectly organized into legal and natural and we want to make that decision, that's their prerogative. But we do not want to force anyone to do so because obviously this is a hot subject.

And we feel that -- a lot of registrars feel that making that distinction puts them legally at risk.

Thank you.

GRAEME BUNTON:

Thanks, Volker.

Okay. Well, that's all fun. Some comments in the chat. We're certainly open to ideas. Man, if we could solve this here and

now, that would be really something. The greatest ICANN breakthrough in history.

[Laughter]

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Hi there. This is Ashley. I don't seem to have a raised hand functionality. So I apologize for just jumping in.

Just real quickly, is there time to talk through alternative ideas? Are we already at a decision point at this stage? I guess where is time best spent? You know, how to deal with how things are presented in council or how to address things substantively as part of the EPDP? If that makes any sense.

GRAEME BUNTON: I can't answer this. I would have to defer to either someone on council or the EPDP.

Sebastien Ducos is saying there's time.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Has anyone proposed to the broader EPDP the idea of basically what I believe it was Volker that was just talking about, in terms of this could be something that contracted parties have the

ability to do if they so choose or want to? It could even be viewed as perhaps -- this is probably going to go too far in your minds -- but even a pilot-type approach of how to deal with it? I mean, something short of a commitment?

GRAEME BUNTON: I would be surprised -- this is Graeme for the transcript. I am terrible at saying my name for the transcript. Reminder to everyone to do that.

James, go ahead.

JAMES BLADEL: Thanks, Graeme. James speaking. I think Volker had his hand up before me, if he wants to.

GRAEME BUNTON: I thought that was an old hand. Let's go you first and then figure out if that's a --

JAMES BLADEL: Thanks. Just to respond to Ashley, I mean, we certainly can propose it. I think one of the things we run into -- again, I hate to sound cynical, but this is just multiple years of wearing down patience to a nub at this point.

But I think the primary concern is, is that -- that we hear is that any degree of discretion option or judgment on the part of a contracted party is a problem for the other side. I think that they're looking for -- if I can speak for them, they're looking for some degree of consistency and ultimately enforceability of these types of terms and standards. So we can certainly propose, I think, along the lines what Volker was presenting, that the option is open to contracted parties.

Indeed, the option is open today. We could say we have 27 different flavors of registrant based on questions that we ask them when they show up to register a domain name. So the option exists.

I think acknowledging it in a policy as a potential to move on, we can table it. We can talk about it. I am just not very hopeful that it will be accepted because I anticipate some of the concerns from the other side will be how do you enforce that and what do you do about that one registrar in that one place who just over - - overapplies their discretion?

GRAEME BUNTON: Thanks, James.

Volker.

VOLKER GREIMANN: Yeah. James said it better. But, basically, the position of the other side is that whatever we offer is not enough. They want to have enforceability. They want to have consistency. And they want to have a "must," and they are not going to rest until they get it.

So I bet we'll have the same discussion in another year as well, when the next PDP is chartered on that topic.

You're welcome.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thank you. Chartering a PDP on accuracy anyway or at least, you know, doing an issues report and going through that full piece, I can live it. And I guess that's going back to Greg's point that not all of these are created equal.

I guess all of that, if I'm going to wrap this up and keep moving us along for this meeting is to say, boy, there's still some contentious things to figure out. It's getting to the end of the road for this thing, though, and so some of this is going to come to a head relatively quickly.

I believe we're able to share that document that I was sort of referencing earlier that sort of explained each of these issues

and where we're at and why we're there. Hopefully, that will be helpful to people.

Again, commend everybody working on this. I hear some of that frustration in James. It feels pretty reasonable to me. You guys have been working on this for so long, and it's been pretty thorny. So thank you, guys.

Michele mentioned transfers way back when. It would be exciting to work on those. That would feel like nice and operational and hopefully less contentious. And I think we've already done the hard work of scoping that out and figuring out how to structure that. I think it's going to be multiple PDPs. If anybody remembers the IRTF ABCD, I think we got as far as D. We'll do something like that again.

But actually doing something that's like policy work but constrained and focused sounds pretty good to me. And transfers are certainly overdue. So hopefully we can begin to get back to that.

Okay. Do we have anything else related to what's going on in the GNSO or EPDP that we want to talk about here? Anybody else have anything we want to raise on those issues? Great. Okay.

DNS abuse. This is sort of on the agenda as a catchall because it's been clearly a topic for this ICANN meeting, you may have noticed.

I think, like, the seven overlapping sessions involving, you know, COVID and DNS abuse, which often turns out not actually to be about COVID or not actually to be about DNS abuse.

I'm not sure I actually have any real substantive discussion here other than I'm pretty pleased with where we're at. I think registrars were responsive to COVID issues. I think it might be after this meeting that GAC is maybe talking about DNS abuse a bit. But in a GAC session yesterday -- I'm going to call it "yesterday," whatever that was -- Gabe from the FBI gave a really good presentation to the GAC how that experience was from a law enforcement perspective. And it was largely really positive. All of which is to say we've collectively done here, I think, a pretty good job.

There is still work to do. We're still working in our DNS abuse team on a number of topics. And we still have another statement to try and get out the door related to some COVID stuff.

And I'm missing from my head -- I'm going to blame the 3:40 in the morning -- an issue that we wanted to sort of tackle next in that arena.

I guess all of that is to say we're doing some good work in there. We have done some good work in there. And we're pretty engaged on this issue.

Oh, maybe I have an idea what it was. It was -- it was a discussion coming up on a panel with the ALAC around thresholds. They want these thresholds of what DNS abuse is that Compliance can then act.

That discussion, I think, is kind of problematic. I'm going to try and participate in that.

My position is going to be this -- and I see a couple hands. We'll get to you guys in a sec -- which is prior to now we didn't really have a definition or a reasonable agreed definition what DNS abuse is. We have now done that. It was taken from the framework. It's pretty constrained: Malware, bots nets, phishing, spam where it serves those other three things. It's pretty tight. I feel good about that.

Okay. Now we have a definition. Now let's go and actually collect some quality data. And actually turns out to be from my experience not a lot published. I did a lot of research, looking around to see what reports I could find and there's not a lot. There's one out of the Netherlands that's probably a few years old now that I thought was pretty good but not a lot else.

So using that definition, let's collect some data. Let's then figure out what the bad actors are doing, what their attributes are, what those characteristics of those bad actors are, and then we can figure out maybe what the tools are we need to deal with them.

I think -- and then tools may well be contractual amendments. There is not a lot in our contracts at the moment. It could be there's something more or there's a creative solution based on these attributes that we found.

But this is, I think, at a macro level where this conversation is going to end up playing out. For the community that wants to address it, I think there is also a relatively clear line between GDPR, people not having access to the data they want, now raising DNS abuse as this primary issue that we have to solve as another mechanism to try and get back to getting at data or trying to constrain registrars in some way.

So I don't think this conversation is going away. I think we're going to have to take a pretty hard look at ourselves and how we operate, as in registrars, not our own necessarily businesses, because I suspect most people on this call are doing pretty good.

One of the things we talked about in the DNS abuse subteam was to ensure that we've all done a pretty good deep dive on our contracts, as I'm sure we all know it pretty well. But to see if there are ways to approach the problems of registrars that are either complicit or negligent in responding to DNS abuse and have a think about are there mechanisms that we can encourage ICANN to use that don't involve us opening up our contracts because that, I think, is generally a nightmare scenario for us. It's long, expensive. It's dangerous. And, you know, our lives are much, much easier if we can figure out solutions without having to do that.

Maybe I'll stop there, and I'll throw it over to Greg whose hand I see. Greg, please.

GREGORY DIBIASE:

Hey. This is Greg. So real quick, first I wanted to just say thank you to Graeme and a lot of others that kind of led the charge on responding to the COVID complaints and kind of getting out ahead of that. I really feel like we saw dividends from that and

response from the FBI. And I just really feel like that effort went a long way.

And then second, with regard to the bad-guy registrars, I just want to note something. I don't think we've ever gotten a clear answer from ICANN Compliance. Like, the narrative continues to be, "Oh, the good guys are in this room. The bad guys are somewhere else." Compliance doesn't have the tools to take down the bad guys.

Compliance, what tools do you need? Like, in other words, you're going down this path. Oh, we would do it but we didn't have X. Like, what is "X"? I don't know who we ask for that, for guidance, or if we want to ask. I don't know if we want to go down that rabbit hole.

But I don't think we have a clear idea from ICANN's perspective what exactly this tool is -- this magic tool is that they can put in our contracts that would fix things. Because like you mentioned, thresholds is really vague. That's not necessarily actionable. So just throwing that out for discussion, and I'll let others talk.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thanks, Greg. Good point. You know, we don't spend our time figuring out how to skirt our contracts and get away with terrible

things. And so I don't think we have, you know, collectively, a really good sense of what those tools might be because we're not trying to do those things that those tools would impact.

I have point-blank very explicitly raised this with Jamie a couple times saying, hey, we don't understand what the abuse really looks like, that's not our game, what is it you think would be helpful and we can talk about it. And his response has been this cannot come from Compliance. This needs to come from the community. So we end up in this back and forth, a sort of circular process where we go: Okay, there's a problem, what would solve that problem, and they go we can't tell you, it needs to come from the community and the community doesn't know because they're not engaged in that process, so -- or they're not engaged in that behavior.

I don't know what that solution is. Maybe that comes back to what I was saying off the top, which is we've got this definition. Let's actually now collect some data about what those bad actors are doing. That might inform this a little bit, is all I can suggest there. But we have certainly tried that, as clearly and specifically as we possibly could have.

Ashley.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Thanks, Graeme. Ashley with GoDaddy.

Yeah, I think we're really well positioned to continue on with this conversation. I'm really glad that we participated in the Contracted Party House webinar last week. I think that really, I think, set the bar high in terms of steering this more towards a data, fact driven conversation which seems to be desperately needed, at least based on some other sessions I've watched.

I think, also, we should have conversations with ICANN. And I'm talking about ICANN staff. I think the time is right for that, and I hope that we're able to kind of continue this leading the conversation rather than constantly being put in a situation to play defense. So I hope we can continue down this path and not be shy to talk about things.

So anyway, for what that's worth.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thanks, Ashley. This is Graeme. A plug for the DNS abuse subteam. If you're not participating in that, we meet every two weeks. It's good discussions trying to figure out best practices for ourselves, registrars internally, documents that are useful to external stakeholders, how to solve issues with, like, registrants and compliance. It's good. I'm enjoying it. The thing I'm going

to keep leading even when I'm not chair anymore. So come on in. The last vestige of power I can hold on to.

James.

JAMES BLADEL:

Mad with power. Thanks, Graeme. James speaking.

Yeah, I was thinking any conversation with Jamie should start with section 5.5.2 of the RAA. And I think that's what they went after -- used to go after, you know, some of the folks that were doing -- you know, involved in spam and some other illegal activities. Owen probably has more -- forgotten more about this issue than I have. But let's -- I almost would say let's not leave this up to the community. Let's help them connect those dots. I'm worried that if we throw this open to the community, we're going to get a lot of really -- I'll be generous say innovative ideas of things that should go into our contracts.

But I just wanted to just generally react to the way you kicked this off. First of all, all the work done by the DNS abuse team really paid off yesterday and in the webinar on the 11th. I think that that was really amazing that we could have registries, registrars, ICANN, and, you know, the OCTO and even some law enforcement folks presenting data that really was telling mostly

the same story. I mean, the peaks varied by a couple of weeks there, whether it was happening in late March or early April, but the pattern, I think, that was emerging was very consistent across all parties. And I think that's -- that was very telling.

I think the two things that frustrated me yesterday in what was otherwise a good day was the comment by ALAC that domain names registered with the terms COVID, corona or virus were 50% more likely to be abusive. How is it that all of these groups can come together with this thoughtful and comprehensive data analysis and then just some guy from some place can throw a number out like 50% more likely to be abusive? And that's taken as, you know, furthering the conversation on policy development. That I found particularly frustrating. You know, just as an intellectual; I mean, forgetting the subject of the issue.

And then the second thing was that I think that we did see -- despite all of the work that went into developing a cogent definition for DNS abuse, we see a lot of efforts to expand that to encompass really just all the bad things on the Internet that might possibly cross paths with the Domain Name System, bring that under the umbrella of domain name abuse, let's bring it into ICANN, let's make it registry and registrars problem to solve. I think that's something -- I'm preaching to the choir here, but that's something we have to be really on guard against because

there is quite a bit in the universe of bad things happening to people out there on the Internet that really is not part of the remit of ICANN and needs to stay out if we're to have any hope of making progress on these other issues.

So -- but otherwise, I just wanted to say thanks to everybody on the DNS abuse team and Graeme for representing us yesterday.

GRAEME BUNTON:

Your point about the ALAC, that slide was from Jonathan Zuck. I don't think we -- it's all public record. It was -- Tobias I think found the source. It was from some security firm that did some analysis of domains registered within a five-day period in I think it was like mid to late February. Like, and so it was like super early in the pandemic. Anyway. Bad data, bad stats, lying with numbers. I think is the short answer.

JAMES BLADEL:

I didn't even know what it meant. 50% more likely to be abused. 50% above what? Normal abuse?

GRAEME BUNTON:

Also, if that's .001 and now it's .0015, is that a material difference for anybody? Yeah, I agree. Very frustrating.

JAMES BLADEL: Really, to me it tainted all of the good work that all of those other groups presented.

Anyway.

GRAEME BUNTON: Okay. Let's wrap that bit up, because I think we only have about seven minutes left, if I'm remembering that this meeting is an hour.

Right. Okay. Thank you, guys, for all of that on DNS abuse. Stay tuned. There's clearly going to be more to come on this issue.

All right. Intro to the new and farewell to the old Ex Com.

We have almost completed our elections. If everybody saw on the list, I have sent out a -- I sent a notice to Christian to start the election for the new tech ops chair which Jothan is running, and I think unopposed; as well as our budget. So I think you should see that coming into your inbox in your future. Please do not forget to vote. That's important.

A big congratulations to Eric and Ashley our new secretary and incoming chair. Welcome aboard, guys. This is very exciting.

We don't have a hard date for takeover in our charter. It's I think at the end of this ICANN meeting. I will pass the baton to Ashley.

In the future, and I'm going to say this very clearly now, we need to move that from the middle meeting of the year, which is sort of a legacy choice from when all the ICANN meetings were the same, to the fall AGM. So I think that buys this current Ex Com or the incoming Ex Com an extra five months or something on their term. Don't anyone be surprised in two to four more years when they get an extra four to five months. It just makes far more sense to do the handover there.

So congratulations, guys. Super excited to have you on board. Thank you, everyone, to your service. Although the way the timing works out is that I think it's only me that's stepping down in the very near future. Tobias, who is tech ops is moving to NomCom. Carolyn who is on NomCom currently, she steps down but that will be in November. Michele is moving off of Council. Thank you again, Michele, for all your work. That will happen in November as well. Christian, who was secretary, moves to GNSO Council, and thank you, Christian, for stepping up. We're excited to have you in that role.

I mean, to Goran in the chat, we'll still get to argue. Don't worry. I'm not going anywhere.

So I've got a little thing to say but maybe I'll pass over to Ashley first because I see her hand up.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: You're talking too much, Graeme. We need time to talk about you. We're going to talk about Graeme.

So first of all, I want to say thank you all. I very much look forward to working with you all and learning from you all. But I got something in the mail today from Graeme, so I don't know if you all can see this, but RSG -- sorry, Registrar Stakeholder Group chair, so I guess we have a new tradition now of passing of the crown. Thank you. This is hilarious. (Laughing.) But I will not wear it at a meeting.

But anyway, I haven't had the pleasure of working with you for all that long, so I would like to turn it over to a few people to say some hopefully very nice words about you, starting first with my illustrious boss Graeme.

JAMES BLADEL: Oh, I hate that word.
Graeme, thank you. You know, one of the things, for those of you who don't know, Graeme is really into cycling. I had the pleasure of riding across a small country with him a couple years

ago, and one thing I really, really add higher about Graeme is there's absolutely no quit, whether it's, you know, going up some mountains or, you know, taking on another year of the chair when we couldn't align the different terms. So even though, by rights, he had definitely earned a rest.

I think that, you know, all of your accomplishments representing us with all the different groups and setting up the different internal structure to organize the work of the stakeholder group, but I think Graeme would be the first to admit his biggest accomplishment was bringing on Zoe. That was a package deal. Fortunately we get to keep her when Graeme steps down. So thank you for everyone.

I will tell you my first ICANN meeting after I had stepped out of chair, it was like coming up for air. It was wonderful, and I wish all of those wonderful feelings onto -- you know, that freedom and that oxygen that's coming your way as well.

And I guess for everyone, I hope that we can all have a toast in person sometime again soon.

So thank you, Graeme.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Yay! Okay. So we're running out of time so I'm going to quickly turn it to Michele but for all of you I encourage you to write all the nice, wonderful things in the chat.

Michele. Go.

MICHELE NEYLON: Thanks. So, Graeme, you reigned as king of the registrars for several years. When I handed over the reins to you I knew it was -- I was handing them over to somebody who would look after the group, which you did. You excelled at that. And we look forward. I hope you enjoy your retirement, enjoy the break, and being able to get some sleep for a change and not having your inbox below up while were you trying to sleep. And don't be a stranger because we do want to toast you in person when we all get to meet again.

GRAEME BUNTON: Thank you, guys. That's very kind of you.

I'm going to -- I'll say my own little bit briefly, if I've got time. I think I've got a minute left.

I think the past four years have been really bonkers in ICANN land. The IANA transition, GDPR, you know, temp spec. I got Tucows sued by ICANN in Germany. We wrote a new charter. We

created, inside the stakeholder group tech ops, policy RA review teams. We completely changed how we approached compliance. We have this new DNS abuse team. I think all of those provide new opportunities for people to engage and lead and I'm really proud of what we have done over the past few years. Could not have done it without everybody inside the SG. Everyone has been so supportive over the past years, technical really been a pleasure to lead.

I'd also specifically like to thank everybody who served on the Ex Com, NomCom, GNSO over the past four years. Hardest part of being chair, and you've heard me saying this before, is making sure you have a strong mandate from membership, and the Ex Com always acts like a proxy for the rest of the SG. So all of those people have been really, really helpful. That's Christian, Benny, Carolyn, Tobias, Pam, Greg, Owen, Theo, Darcy, Jen, Sarah, Ben Anderson. Big thank you to Michele who did pass me a stakeholder group in excellent shape. And James, funny enough, who has always had time and wisdom to share. I absolutely agree that this is impossible without Zoe. Zoe, thank you so much. You have allowed me to do this job. You've built the foundation that is the SG and you run it with grace and patience. And I appreciate that so much.

So congratulations, Ashley. I will pass you the baton formally in the very near future.

Thank you, everyone, for coming out, I think. And thank you everyone for your support over the past four years. I really appreciate it.

I think that brings us to time.

I love the crown. I'm so glad that showed up for today. That's great.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Literally got it after I had dinner. I was like, Wow, wasn't that perfect timing?

GRAEME BUNTON: Great. Okay. Well, I think we have a stakeholder group meeting again next week. So it won't be too long before we all talk again. Thank you, everyone, for joining. Have yourself a wonderful rest of your evening, morning, afternoon, whatever it may be. Thanks, all.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]